

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 KIRSTEN HAYE, et al.,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

14 IXIA HOLDINGS, LLC, et al,

15 Defendants.

Case No. 1:20-cv-01810 DAD JLT

**ORDER DENYING STIPULATION TO
EXTEND TIME FOR DEFENDANTS TO
RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT**

(Doc. 11)

16 The parties have stipulated to allow the defendants to respond to the complaint within ten days
17 after the Court rules on the motion to remand the matter to state court. They had filed a similar
18 stipulation earlier (Doc. 5) and, in response, the Court denied the motion as unripe and ordered them to
19 demonstrate good cause to extend the deadline, if the stipulation was again filed. (Doc. 6) Nevertheless,
20 the parties have again filed the stipulation and conclude only that delaying the responsive pleading will
21 conserve the parties and the Court's resources. (Doc. 11.) However, they fail to provide any facts to
22 support that conclusion. No matter how the motion to remand is resolved, a responsive pleading is
23 required. Allowing this stipulation would merely delay the case once the motion is decided. Thus, the
24 stipulation is DENIED.

25
26 IT IS SO ORDERED.

27 Dated: January 24, 2021

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

28